

Numerical study of a Mixed Ising Ferrimagnetic System

G. M. Buendía

*Supercomputer Computations Research Institute, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4052, and
Departamento de Física, Universidad Simón Bolívar, Apdo 89000, Caracas 1080, Venezuela**

M. A. Novotny

*Supercomputer Computations Research Institute, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4052
(February 1, 2008)*

We present a study of a classical ferrimagnetic model on a square lattice in which the two interpenetrating square sublattices have spins one-half and one. This model is relevant for understanding bimetallic molecular ferrimagnets that are currently being synthesized by several experimental groups. We perform exact ground-state calculations for the model and employ Monte Carlo and numerical transfer-matrix techniques to obtain the finite-temperature phase diagram for both the transition and compensation temperatures. When only nearest-neighbor interactions are included, our nonperturbative results indicate no compensation point or tricritical point at finite temperature, which contradicts earlier results obtained with mean-field analysis.

PACS Number(s): 64.60.My, 64.60.Qb, 02.70.Rw, 03.50.Kk

I. INTRODUCTION

Stable, crystalline room-temperature magnets with spontaneous moments are currently the subject of a great deal of interest because of their potential device applications, such as thermomagnetic recording [1]. It is widely believed that ferrimagnetic ordering plays a fundamental role in these materials and the synthesis of new ferrimagnets is at the moment an active field in material science.

In a ferrimagnetic material two inequivalent moments interacting antiferromagnetically can achieve a spontaneous magnetization at temperatures that are low compared with the strength of the interaction. At these low temperatures, the inequivalent moments are antiparallel but do not cancel [2,3]. This is particularly obvious in the case of a linear chain, where the sum of the moments in each unit cell can result in a large moment for the chain. If adjacent chains can be positioned such that their moments are parallel, then a transition can occur at low temperatures to a state of 3-dimensional (3-D) ferrimagnetic order [4].

Important advances have been made by several groups in the synthesis of ferrimagnetic chains [5,6]. However it is difficult to achieve high critical temperatures with one-dimensional materials. Consequently the discovery of bimetallic molecular materials with spontaneous moments at temperatures as high as 43 K [7] has directed the experimentalist toward the formation of 2-D and 3-D bimetallic lattices [8].

Synthesis of single-chain and double-chain ferrimagnets is now becoming standard, and attempts to synthe-

*Permanent Address.

size higher-dimensional polymeric ferrimagnets are starting to give very encouraging results. Some of the materials currently under investigation are 2-D organometallic ferrimagnets [7], 2-D networks of the mixed-metal material $\{[P(Ph)_4][MnCr(ox)_3]\}_n$ where Ph is phenyl and ox is oxalate [9], 3-D ferrimagnets with critical temperatures up to 240 K [10], and the recently developed amorphous $V(TCNE)_x \cdot y(\text{solvent})$ with ordering temperatures as high as 400 K [11].

The intense activity related with the synthesis of ferrimagnetic materials requires a parallel effort in the theoretical study of these materials. Mixed Ising systems provide good models to study ferrimagnetism. The magnetic properties of these model systems have been examined by high-temperatures series expansions [12] and renormalization-group [13], mean-field [14], effective-field approaches [15,16]. An exact solution of a mixed Ising system on a union-jack lattice (equivalent to one of the models studied in this paper) has recently been found for a low-dimensional manifold in the parameter space [17]. In this work we study a classical model of a ferrimagnetic system: a mixed spin 1/2 and spin 1 system on a square lattice. We are interested particularly in the phase diagram and in the location and characterization of the compensation point: the one temperature where the resultant magnetization vanishes below the critical point (type N in the Néel classification [2]). The behavior at the compensation point is of technological significance since at this point only a small driving field is required to change the sign of the resultant magnetization. In a model for a ferrimagnetic thin film, it has been found that the coercivity diverges at the compensation point [18]. Preliminary results on our model have been published elsewhere [19].

Experimental studies on recently synthesized compounds such as $N(n-C_nH_{2n+1})_4Fe^{II}Fe^{III}(C_2O_4)_3$ with $n=3-5$ have found critical temperatures between 35 and 48 K, and some of these compounds exhibit a compensation point near 30 K [20].

In Sec. II we present the Hamiltonian of the model and its ground states. We next briefly describe the non-perturbative techniques used to study the model: Monte Carlo (Sec. III) and numerical transfer-matrix calculations (Sec. IV). In Sec. V we discuss our results and finally we present the conclusions of our work in Sec. VI.

II. MODEL AND ITS GROUND STATES

Our model consists of two interpenetrating square sublattices. One sublattice has spins σ on the lattice sites, where σ has two states, $\sigma=\pm 1$. The spins σ are spin 1/2, but we choose to put the factor of 1/2 into the interaction parameters. The sites of the other sublattice have spins S which can have three states, $S=\pm 1, 0$. Each spin σ has only S spins as nearest neighbors and vice versa. The Hamiltonian includes all possible nearest and next-

nearest neighbor interactions and external fields. It is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H} = & -J_1 \sum_{\langle nn \rangle} \sigma_i S_j - J_2 \sum_{\langle nn \rangle} \sigma_i S_j^2 - J_3 \sum_{\langle nnn \rangle} S_j S_l \\
& -J_4 \sum_{\langle nnn \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_k - J_5 \sum_{\langle nnn \rangle} S_j^2 S_l^2 - \frac{J_6}{2} \sum_{\langle nnn \rangle} (S_j S_l^2 + S_j^2 S_l) \\
& -H_{1/2} \sum_i \sigma_i - H_1 \sum_j S_j + D \sum_j S_j^2
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the sums $\sum_{\langle nn \rangle}$ and $\sum_{\langle nnn \rangle}$ are over all the nearest-neighbor (nn) and next-nearest-neighbor (nnn) bonds, respectively. The sums $\sum_i$ and $\sum_j$ run over all sites of the σ and S sublattices, respectively. Each J is an exchange interaction parameter, D is the crystal field, and H_1 and $H_{1/2}$ are the external fields, all in energy units.

From now on, we will label a model by enumerating the parameters different from zero in the Hamiltonian. For example the J_1 - J_2 - D model is the model with all the parameters in the above Hamiltonian zero except J_1 , J_2 , and D . In all cases, we fix J_1 to be <0 , so the coupling between the nn spins is antiferromagnetic.

In order to find the ground-state diagram for finite values of the parameters, we use a 2×2 cell. With rotational symmetry taken into account, it has $2^2 3^2 / 2 = 18$ configurations. In Table I we show the 18 different configurations of the unit cell with their respective energies and degeneracies. Which of these states is the actual ground state depends on the values of the parameters in the Hamiltonian. Figs. 1 through 3 show the ground-state diagram for different combinations of parameters. In each graph the ground-state configurations are indicated using the notation employed in Table I. The boundaries between the regions are obtained by pairwise equating the ground-state energies.

III. MONTE CARLO CALCULATIONS

Standard importance sampling methods [21] were applied to simulate the model described by the Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) on square lattices of $L \times L$ sites with periodic boundary conditions. Most of the data were obtained with $L=40$, but we also present some results for $L=10, 16$ and $L=60$. Configurations were generated by sequentially traversing the lattice and making single spin-flip attempts. The flips were accepted or rejected with standard heat-bath dynamics. We use the very long period, on the order of 2^{95} , random number generator KISS (for Keep It Simple, Stupid) [22]. Data were generated with 25000 Monte Carlo steps per site after discarding the first 2500 steps. The error bars were taken from the standard deviation of blocks of 500 measurements each. We define $\beta=1/k_B T$, and take the Boltzmann's constant $k_B=1$. Our program calculates the internal energy

$$U = \frac{1}{L^2} \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle, \quad (2)$$

the specific heat

$$C = \frac{\beta^2}{L^2} [\langle \mathcal{H}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle^2], \quad (3)$$

the sublattice magnetizations M_1 and M_2 defined as

$$M_1 = \frac{2}{L^2} \left\langle \sum_i \sigma_i \right\rangle, \quad (4)$$

$$M_2 = \frac{2}{L^2} \left\langle \sum_j S_j \right\rangle. \quad (5)$$

and the total magnetization $M=1/2(M_1+gM_2)$, where the factor $1/2$ gives the correct normalization for the whole lattice since M_1 and M_2 are normalized for the sublattice. Throughout this paper we take the g -factor to be $g=1/2$. We also measured the order parameters

$$O_{\pm} = \frac{1}{L^2} \left\langle \left| \sum_i S_i \pm g \sum_j \sigma_j \right| \right\rangle \quad (6)$$

and the susceptibilities associated with M , M_1 , M_2 , and $O_{\pm}$. The averages are taken over all generated configurations, the sums over i are over all the sites with σ spins, and the sums over j are over all the sites with S spins. There are $L^2/2$ terms in each sum. We verified that our results are in agreement with exact enumeration studies for $L=2$, and that the ground-state diagrams are reproduced for different combinations of the parameters in the Hamiltonian.

For an infinite lattice the order parameter O_+ would not be defined with the absolute value in Eq. 6, and would change sign at the compensation temperature T_{comp} . However, for a finite lattice the absolute values are required to keep the order parameters nonzero in the limit of a long measurement time. An efficient way to locate T_{comp} using the Monte Carlo data is to find the crossing point between the absolute values of the sublattice magnetizations, i.e.,

$$|M_1(T_{\text{comp}})| = g|M_2(T_{\text{comp}})| \quad (7)$$

with the conditions

$$\text{sign}(M_1(T_{\text{comp}})) = -\text{sign}(M_2(T_{\text{comp}})) \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\text{comp}} < T_c. \quad (8)$$

These relations assure that $O_+(T_{\text{comp}})$ as defined in Eq. (6) is equal to zero.

IV. TRANSFER-MATRIX CALCULATIONS

Traditional numerical transfer-matrix (TM) calculations [23] were performed as a second nonperturbative method to obtain finite-temperature phase diagrams, critical exponents, and compensation temperatures. These results were compared with the Monte Carlo results, as well as with previous mean-field calculations.

For a square lattice with different spins on each of the two square sublattices care should be taken to ensure that the TM is symmetric. A symmetric TM is preferred, since it is much easier numerically to calculate its eigenvalues and eigenvectors. We used two different TM constructions, both of which give symmetric transfer matrices, as detailed below. The largest eigenvalues and eigenvectors of these symmetric transfer matrices were then calculated using the NAG subroutine F02FJE. This subroutine requires only multiplication of an arbitrary vector by the TM, and consequently it is not necessary to store the entire TM in memory. This allows us to use very large transfer matrices in our calculations. For both TM implementations, the lattice is wrapped on a torus of finite width and infinite extent, and periodic boundary conditions are imposed. However, the periodic boundary conditions are for a given column of spins, and lead to different boundary conditions in terms of the primitive lattice vectors since the torus of spins may not be along a direction given by a single primitive lattice vector.

Two different implementations of the transfer matrix were utilized. These are called TM1 and TM2, and the details of the construction of the transfer matrices is given in the appendix.

The remainder of the equations in this section are stated for the TM1 implementation with N , but would be equally valid for the TM2 implementation with N replaced by $\tilde{N}$. The inverse correlation length, ξ_N^{-1} , is given by the ratio of the largest and next-largest eigenvalues of the TM as

$$\xi_N^{-1} = \ln \left| \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \right|. \quad (9)$$

The scaling form for ξ is [23]

$$\xi_N = N\mathcal{F}(tN^{y_T}), \quad (10)$$

where $t = |(T - T_c)/T_c|$ is the reduced temperature. At $t=0$ Eq. (10) allows one to calculate the finite-strip estimates for the critical temperature T_c as the temperature where the phenomenological scaling relation

$$\frac{\xi_N}{N} = \frac{\xi_{N+1}}{N+1} \quad (11)$$

holds. Differentiating the scaling relation Eq. (10), and evaluating it at the estimated value of T_c given by Eq. (11) gives the finite-strip estimate of the critical exponent $y_T=1/\nu$ as [23]

$$y_T + 1 = \frac{\ln [d\xi_N/dt|_{t=0}/d\xi_{N+1}/dt|_{t=0}]}{\ln [N/(N+1)]}. \quad (12)$$

The differentiation in Eq. (12) was performed as a two-point finite difference.

The TM calculation of the compensation point was only done in the implementation TM2. The standard method of calculating the magnetization by diagonalizing a 2×2 matrix formed from the expectation values of the magnetization operator using the two-largest eigenvectors was used [24]. If $\mathbf{M}$ is the magnetization operator, the solution of the equation

$$\det \begin{vmatrix} \langle 1|\mathbf{M}|1\rangle - m & \langle 1|\mathbf{M}|2\rangle \\ \langle 2|\mathbf{M}|1\rangle & \langle 2|\mathbf{M}|2\rangle - m \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad (13)$$

give the magnetization. Here $\langle i|$ ($|i\rangle$) is the left (right) eigenvector associated with the i^{th} largest eigenvalue of the transfer matrix. For a given $\tilde{N}$ the compensation temperature is the temperature below the critical temperature where the magnetization is zero.

V. RESULTS

We first tested the mean-field predictions that the J_1 - D model has a tricritical point and a range of D values with a compensation point. The ground state for this model corresponds to the line $J_2=0$ in Fig. 1. Figure 4 shows the finite-temperature phase diagram for the J_1 - D model as a function of $D/|J_1|$ (remember $J_1=-1$) obtained with the Monte Carlo and transfer-matrix methods, and we also show in the same graph the mean-field results [14]. The transfer-matrix (TM1) results were obtained using $N \times \infty$ and $(N+1) \times \infty$ lattices, with $N=4, 6$, and 8 . The Monte Carlo data for the critical temperature were obtained from the location of the specific heat maximum for lattices with $L=10$ and $L=16$. These results were confirmed with $L=40$, whose results are not shown in the figure. The finite-strip width estimates for y_T calculated with TM1 and TM2 are consistent with the Ising value $y_T=1$ and are presented in Fig. 5. Indeed, as N or $\tilde{N}$ increases the value for y_T approaches the Ising value for all $D/|J_1| < 4$. These numerical transfer-matrix results strongly suggest that there is a multicritical point only at $T=0$ located at the point $D/|J_1|=4$. There is no indication of a tricritical point at finite temperature. It is possible that a tricritical point is located at a much lower temperature that we could study, but even at our lowest value of T_c we do not see any indication of a tricritical point in the behavior of y_T . An effective-field calculation [15] also has found that $T_c=0$ for $D/|J_1| \geq 4$. Our detailed TM study shows that T_c goes linearly to zero as $T_c/|J_1|=2.45(\pm 0.11)(4-D/|J_1|)$ as $D/|J_1| \rightarrow 4$. This linear relation holds extremely well between $D/|J_1| \approx 3.8$ and our lowest value of $D/|J_1|=3.9995$ where we get $T_c/|J_1|=0.001225$.

A further study of the finite-temperature phase diagram for the J_1 – J_2 – D model leads us to the conclusion that there is no compensation point for any range of parameters of this model. Adding the field interactions (H_1 and $H_{1/2}$) does not seem to change this fact. Thus we conclude that a compensation point can not be induced in this model by nearest-neighbor interactions.

Our next step was to include next-nearest-neighbor interactions. Adding the J_3 interaction (between the S spins), we found that the finite-temperature phase diagram for the J_1 – J_3 – D model also showed no evidence of a compensation temperature.

Based on the above evidence, we concluded that a model with a compensation temperature different from zero must have, at least, interactions with non-zero parameters J_1 and J_4 (between the σ spins). A general study of the finite-temperature phase diagram of the J_1 – J_4 – D model shows that a compensation point exists for a certain range of the J_4 parameter in the region of Fig. 3 bounded by $J_4/|J_1| > 0$ and $D/|J_1| < 4$. In Fig. 6 we show an example of the behavior of the magnetization where the compensation and the critical point can be clearly observed. In Fig. 7 we show the critical and compensation temperatures plotted against J_4 for a particular value of D . The compensation temperature does not exist until the J_4 interaction takes some minimum value, after which it is almost independent of J_4 . This minimum value depends on D as is shown in Fig. 8, where we plot as a function of D the value of J_4 at which a compensation point ($T_{\text{comp}} < T_c$) appears. Fig. 8 indicates that only at $D/J_1=4$ can there be a compensation point without the nnn interactions ($J_4=0$). However, as one sees in Fig. 9, the compensation temperature seems to go to zero at this point, as does T_c .

The critical temperature calculated using the numerical transfer-matrix method (TM2) for the J_1 – J_4 – D model, is shown in Fig. 10(a). The Monte Carlo estimates for T_c obtained from the maximum value of the specific heat are in excellent agreement with the ones obtained with the transfer matrix. To facilitate the reading of the critical temperature we present the curves for some values of D in Fig. 10(b). For large values of J_4 the critical temperature seems to be independent of D , but for small values of J_4 the dependence on D is clearly observed in the graphs. In Fig. 10(c) we show a detailed view of the behavior of the critical temperature for a particular value of D calculated with different transfer-matrix sizes. The finite size effects can be clearly appreciated. Also in this figure we show an exact result calculated from [17]. It is important to emphasize that the exact solution is only known for the combination of parameters shown by the dashed line in the figure. Our numerical techniques cover the entire region of parameters.

The compensation temperature for the J_1 – J_4 – D model is shown in Fig. 11, where the dotted line corresponds to Fig. 9. As before, we choose to plot the numerical transfer-matrix results. The Monte Carlo results are in excellent agreement. Again the data strongly suggest

that only at $D/J_1=4$ is there a compensation temperature for $J_4=0$, and that it seems to be zero. There is no compensation temperature at $J_4=0$ for any other value of D .

Small scale studies that included the other parameters of the Hamiltonian seem to indicate that for small values of the parameters J_3 , J_5 , and J_6 there are only minor quantitative changes in the behavior of T_c and T_{comp} . However, the external fields H_1 and $H_{1/2}$ play a more important role and the same seems to happen with the parameter J_2 . This is expected since for large values of D , J_2 plays a role similar to an external field.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have applied two nonperturbative methods: Monte Carlo and numerical transfer-matrix calculations to study a mixed Ising system on a square-lattice. The model has two interpenetrating square sublattices, one with spins $\sigma=\pm 1$ and the other with spins $S=\pm 1, 0$. The Hamiltonian has all possible fields and nn and nnn interactions. In order to study the ferrimagnetic behavior of the model, we choose the coupling between nearest-neighbors to be antiferromagnetic. We calculated exactly the ground-state phase diagrams. Also, we have obtained the finite-temperature phase diagram and the critical and compensation temperatures for some interesting combinations of parameters. We found excellent agreement between the Monte Carlo and numerical transfer-matrix data. Our results show that a compensation point is induced by the presence of an interaction J_4 between the spin-1/2 spins σ (next-nearest neighbors in the lattice). A minimum strength of the nnn interaction $J_4 > 0$ for a compensation point to exist was found to depend on the other parameters of the Hamiltonian. We have demonstrated this in particular for the crystal field interaction D . We found that the system with only nn interactions does not have a compensation temperature except at the point where the crystal field takes its critical value, $D/|J_1|=4$, and the compensation temperature and critical temperature seem to both be zero at this point. We also failed to find any evidence of a tricritical point at a finite temperature. Our nonperturbative results are in contradiction with mean-field studies for the J_1 - D model, in which a tricritical point at finite temperatures and a range of D values with a compensation point were found [14,16]. Thus we expect that there may be regions in some experimental two-dimensional ferrimagnets where compensation points may vanish when the couplings between nn and nnn spins are changed, for example by the application of external pressures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Useful discussions with C. P. Landee, P.-A. Lindgård, and P. A. Rikvold are gratefully acknowledged. We also thank J. Zhang for checking our exact ground-state calculations for the J_1-D model against his numerical ones. Supported in part by the Florida State University, Supercomputer Computations Research Institute, which is partially funded through Contract #DE-FC05-85ER25000 by the U.S. Department of Energy, and by Florida State University through time granted on its Cray Y-MP supercomputer. MAN also acknowledges support from the U.S. D.O.E. grant #DE-FG05-94ER45518. GMB also acknowledges financial support by the Venezuelan Science Counsel, CONICIT. MAN is also supported by Department of Energy contract #DE-FG05-94ER45518 and National Science Foundation contract #DMR-9520325.

APPENDIX A: APPENDIX: CONSTRUCTION OF THE TRANSFER MATRICES

This appendix presents the details of the construction of the two implementations, labeled TM1 and TM2, of the transfer matrices that were used in the numerical calculations. We use the notation and methodology of Ref. [25] to show the form of the TM and that the TM is symmetric. It is important to realize that in this notation curly brackets denote the matrix product introduced in Ref. [25].

The first implementation of the TM (TM1) consists of N spins $\sigma=\pm 1$ in the first column and N spins $S=0,\pm 1$ in the second column. This structure is iterated for an infinite number of columns. This only gives a symmetric matrix only if the nnn interactions are zero ($J_3=J_4=J_5=J_6=0$). The TM can be written as the symmetric matrix $\mathbf{D}_{1/2}^{1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{D}_{1/2}^{1/2}$ where the $\mathbf{D}$ matrices are diagonal matrices. The $2^N \times 3^N$ matrix $\mathbf{A}$, written for $N=4$, is explicitly given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} & \\ & \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} \\ & & \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the 2×3 matrix $\mathbf{Q}$, which takes into account the interactions with J_1 and J_2 , is

$$\mathbf{Q} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \exp[\beta(J_1 + J_2)] & 1 & \exp[\beta(-J_1 + J_2)] \\ \exp[\beta(-J_1 - J_2)] & 1 & \exp[\beta(J_1 - J_2)] \end{array} \right). \quad (\text{A2})$$

In the normal fashion, the $2^N \times 2^N$ diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D}_{1/2}$ contains interactions of the field $H_{1/2}$, while the $3^N \times 3^N$ diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D}_1$ contains interactions of the fields D and H_1 .

In the second TM implementation (TM2) each column contains $\tilde{N}$ spins σ and $\tilde{N}$ spins S . The spins are numbered so that in one column a spin σ is the first spin, and in the second column a spin S is the first spin. The TM has the form $\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{B} \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{D}^{1/2}$ where each of the matrices is $6^N \times 6^N$. The matrix $\mathbf{B}$, written for $\tilde{N}=3$, has the form

$$\mathbf{B} = \left\{ \begin{array}{cccccc} \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{S} & & & & \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{Q}^T & \mathbf{R} & & & \\ & \mathbf{S} & \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{S} & & \\ & & \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{Q}^T & \mathbf{R} & \\ & & & \mathbf{S} & \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{R} & & & & \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{Q}^T \end{array} \right\}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where the 2×3 matrix $\mathbf{Q}$ is given by Eq. (A2). The 2×2 matrix $\mathbf{S}$ takes into account nnn interactions between spins σ (interaction J_4),

$$\mathbf{S} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \exp(\beta J_4) & \exp(-\beta J_4) \\ \exp(-\beta J_4) & \exp(\beta J_4) \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{A4})$$

and the 3×3 matrix $\mathbf{R}$ takes into account nn interactions between spins S (interactions J_3 , J_5 , and J_6),

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \exp[\beta(J_5 + J_3 + J_6)] & 1 & \exp[\beta(J_5 - J_3)] \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \exp[\beta(J_5 - J_3)] & 1 & \exp[\beta(J_5 + J_3 - J_6)] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

The $6^{\tilde{N}} \times 6^{\tilde{N}}$ diagonal matrix contains interactions between the spins and the fields as well as nn interactions of J_1 and J_2 within a column. For $\tilde{N}=3$ it is given by

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} & \mathbf{Q} & & & & \\ & \mathbf{H} & \mathbf{Q}^T & & & \\ & & \mathbf{h} & \mathbf{Q} & & \\ & & & \mathbf{H} & \mathbf{Q}^T & \\ & & & & \mathbf{h} & \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{Q}^T & & & & & \mathbf{H} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where the 2×2 diagonal matrix $\mathbf{h}$ has diagonal elements $\exp(\beta H_{1/2})$ and $\exp(-\beta H_{1/2})$ and the 3×3 diagonal matrix $\mathbf{H}$ has diagonal elements $\exp[\beta(H_1 - D)]$, 1, and $\exp[\beta(-H_1 - D)]$. The $6^{\tilde{N}} \times 6^{\tilde{N}}$ diagonal matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ has the same form as Eq. (A6), but starts with $\mathbf{H}$ rather than $\mathbf{h}$ as the first element in the matrix product.

-
- [1] *Magnetic Molecular Materials, NATO ASI Series*, edited by D. Gatteschi, O. Kahn, J. S. Miller, and F. Palacio (Kluwe Academic, Dordrecht, 1991).
 - [2] L. Néel, *Ann. de Phys.* **3**, 137 (1948).
 - [3] B. Szpunar and P.-A. Lindgård, *Phys. Stat. Sol. B* **82**, 449 (1977).
 - [4] For a theoretical study see J. Curely, R. Georges, M. Drillon, M. Belaiche, and K. Benkhoulja, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 3527 (1992).
 - [5] O. Kahn, Y. Pei, M. Verdaguer, J. P. Renard, J. Sletten, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **110**, 782 (1988); A. Caneschi, D. Gatteschi, R. Sessoli, P. Rey, *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **176**, 329 (1989).
 - [6] R. D. Willet, Z. Wang, S. Molnar, K. Brewer, C. P. Landee, M. M. Turnbull and W. Zhang, *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **233**, 277 (1993).
 - [7] H. Tamaki, Z. J. Zhong, N. Matsumoto, S. Kida, M. Koikawa, N. Achiwa, Y. Hashimoto, and H. Okawa, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **114**, 6974 (1992); H. Okawa, N. Matsumoto, H. Tamaki, and M. Ohba, *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **233**, 257 (1993).
 - [8] M. M. Turnbull, C. P. Landee, T. C. Soesbe, and R. D. Willett, *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **233**, 269 (1993).
 - [9] S. Decurtins, H. W. Schmalle, H. R. Oswald, A. Linden, J. Ensling, P. Gülich, and A. Hauser, *Inorganica Chimica Acta* **65**, 216 (1994).
 - [10] T. Mallah, S. Tiebaut, M. Verdaguer, and P. Veillet, *Science* **262**, 1554 (1993).
 - [11] G. Du, J. Joo, and A. J. Epstein, *J. Appl. Phys.* **73**, 6566 (1993); J. Manriquez, G. T. Lee, R. Scott, A. Epstein and J. Miller, *Science* **252**, 1415 (1991).
 - [12] G. J. A. Hunter, R. C. L. Jenkins and C. J. Tinsley, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **23**, 4547 (1990); R. G. Bowers and B. Y. Yousif, *Phys. Lett.* **96A**, 49 (1983).
 - [13] S. L. Schofield and R. G. Bowers, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **13**, 3697 (1980).
 - [14] T. Kaneyoshi and J. C. Chen, *J. Magn. Mag. Mat.* **98**, 201 (1991).
 - [15] A. F. Siqueira and I. P. Fittipaldi, *J. Mag. Mag. Mat.* **54-57**, 678 (1986).
 - [16] T. Kaneyoshi, *Sol. Stat. Comm.* **70**, 975 (1989).
 - [17] A. Lipowski and T. Horiguchi, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **29**, L261 (1995).
 - [18] M. Mansuripur, *J. Appl. Phys.* **61**, 1580 (1987).
 - [19] G. Buendía, M. A. Novotny and J. Zhang, in *Computer Simulations in Condensed Matter Physics VII*, edited by D. P. Landau, K. K. Mon, and H. B. Schüttler, 223 (Springer, Berlin, 1994).
 - [20] C. Mathonière, C. J. Nuttall, S. G. Carling, and P. Day, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, in press (1995).
 - [21] K. Binder, in *Monte Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics*, edited by K. Binder (Springer, Berlin, 1979).
 - [22] G. Marsaglia, and A. Zaman, unpublished.
 - [23] M. P. Nightingale, in *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems*, edited by V. Privman

(World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).

- [24] N. C. Bartelt, T. L. Einstein, and L. D. Roelofs, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 1616 (1986).
- [25] M. A. Novotny, J. Math. Phys. **20**, 1146 (1978); *op. cit.* **29**, 2280 (1988).

FIG. 1. Ground-state diagram for the J_1-J_2-D model. There are three regions, in each of which the configurations of the 2×2 cells are labeled as in Table I. The transition lines not parallel to the coordinate axes are labeled by the right-hand side of their defining equations, $J_2=aD-bJ_1$.

FIG. 2. Ground-state diagram for the J_1-J_3-D model. The notation is analogous to Fig. 1.

FIG. 3. Ground-state phase diagram for the J_1-J_4-D model. The notation is analogous to Fig. 1.

FIG. 4. Finite-temperature phase diagram for the J_1-D model. The solid line corresponds to the mean-field approximation. [14] The symbols $\diamond$ (*) with error estimates are Monte Carlo results on lattices with $L=10$ (16). The numerical transfer-matrix (TM1) results are also shown for system size $N\times\infty$ and $(N+1)\times\infty$ with $N=4$ ($\circ$), $N=6$ (+), and $N=8$ ($\square$). In the limit $D\rightarrow-\infty$ the model reduces to a nn spin ± 1 Ising model, and the arrow indicates the exact value of T_c in this limit.

FIG. 5. Numerical transfer-matrix results for the critical exponent $y_T=1/\nu$. Finite-strip-width estimates using $N\times\infty$ and $(N+1)\times\infty$ lattices and TM1 are shown for $N=4$ ($\circ$), $N=6$ (+), and $N=8$ ($\square$). The results obtained from TM2 with $\tilde{N}\times\infty$ and $(\tilde{N}+1)\times\infty$ are shown for $\tilde{N}=2$ ($\times$) and $\tilde{N}=3$ (*). It is clear that the results are consistent with the Ising value $y_T=1$. This becomes more evident as we increase the size.

FIG. 6. Magnetization vs temperature for the J_1-J_4-D model at $D/|J_1|=3.6$ and $J_4/|J_1|=3$. The distinctive behavior of the magnetization at the compensation temperature and at the critical temperature can be observed clearly. The results shown are actually of $|M_1|-1/2|M_2|$ for system sizes $L=40$ (+) and $L=60$ ($\times$). The ones for $M_1+1/2M_2$ and O_+ are almost identical except close to T_c where finite-size effects are largest. The solid curves give the magnetization from Eq. (13) from the numerical transfer matrix calculations with $\tilde{N}=2$ through $\tilde{N}=5$. The numerical TM estimates for T_c from Eq. (11) are shown as vertical lines for $\tilde{N}=2, 3$ (dashed) and $\tilde{N}=3, 4$ (solid). In the insert we show the absolute value of the sublattice magnetizations, $|M_1|$ and $1/2|M_2|$. It is clear that at the compensation point the two sublattice magnetization cancel each other. In contrast, at T_c each one goes independently to zero, except for the remanent finite-size effects.

FIG. 7. Critical and compensation temperatures, T_c and T_{comp} , for the J_1-J_4-D model at $D/|J_1|=3.6$. The critical temperature is shown as a solid line and the compensation temperature as a dotted line. Monte Carlo results for $L=40$ are shown by the symbol $\diamond$ with error bars. The numerical transfer-matrix (TM2) results for T_{comp} with $\tilde{N}=2$ are represented by $\times$. For T_c the numerical TM sizes are $\tilde{N}=2, 3$ ($\times$) and $\tilde{N}=3, 4$ ($\circ$). The lines are guides for the eye.

FIG. 8. Minimum value of J_4 for the J_1-J_4-D model for which a compensation point exists. The symbols have the same meaning as in Fig. 6. $J_4(\text{minimum})$ seems to go to zero as $D/|J_1|\rightarrow 4$. The lines are guides to the eye.

FIG. 9. The compensation temperature at the values of $J_4(\text{minimum})$ given in Fig. 7, shown versus D . The numerical transfer-matrix data, TM2 with $\tilde{N}=2$ ($\times$), show that the compensation temperature approaches zero at the point given by $J_4=0$, $D/|J_1|=4$.

FIG. 10. (a) Critical temperature for the J_1-J_4-D model. T_c is shown as a function of J_4 and D . The values were obtained with the numerical transfer-matrix method TM2, with $\tilde{N}=2, 3$. (b) Critical temperature for $D/|J_1|=0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ and 5 taken from (a). The minimum of each graph depends on the values of J_4 and D , but as $|J_4|$ increases, T_c becomes independent of D . (c) A blow-up of the $D/|J_1|=2$ region is shown. This illustrates the finite-size effects going from $\tilde{N}=2, 3$ (top solid line) to $\tilde{N}=3, 4$ (lower solid line). Also shown is the curve (dashed line) along which the exact solution is known, and the bicritical point ($\circ$) [17].

FIG. 11. Compensation temperature for the J_1-J_4-D model, calculated with TM2 and $\tilde{N}=2$. The dotted line corresponds to Fig. 9.

TABLE I. Ground-state configurations, degeneracies, and energies per lattice site for the 2×2 cells. The spin states are indicated as follows: $S=0$ ($\odot$), $S=+1$ ($\oplus$), $S=-1$ ($\ominus$), $\sigma=1$ (+) and $\sigma=-1$ (-).

#	Configuration	Degeneracy	Energy per site
1	$\odot$ + + $\odot$	1	$E_1 = -\frac{1}{2}H_{\frac{1}{2}} - J_4$
2	$\odot$ + - $\odot$	2	$E_2 = J_4$
3	$\odot$ - - $\odot$	1	$E_3 = H_{1/2}/2 - J_4$
4	$\oplus$ + + $\odot$	2	$E_4 = -H_{1/2}/2 - H_1/4 + D/4 - J_1 - J_2 - J_4$
5	$\oplus$ + - $\odot$	4	$E_5 = -H_1/4 + D/4 + J_4$
6	$\oplus$ - - $\odot$	2	$E_6 = H_{1/2}/2 - H_1/4 + D/4 + J_1 + J_2 - J_4$
7	$\ominus$ + + $\odot$	2	$E_7 = -H_{1/2}/2 + H_1/4 + D/4 + J_1 - J_2 - J_4$
8	$\ominus$ + - $\odot$	4	$E_8 = H_1/4 + D/4 + J_4$
9	$\ominus$ - - $\odot$	2	$E_9 = H_{1/2}/2 + H_1/4 + D/4 - J_1 + J_2 - J_4$
10	$\oplus$ + + $\ominus$	2	$E_{10} = -H_{1/2}/2 + D/2 - 2J_2 + J_3 - J_4 - J_5$
11	$\oplus$ + - $\ominus$	4	$E_{11} = D/2 + J_3 + J_4 - J_5$
12	$\oplus$ - - $\ominus$	2	$E_{12} = H_{1/2}/2 + D/2 + 2J_2 + J_3 - J_4 - J_5$
13	$\oplus$ + + $\oplus$	1	$E_{13} = -H_{1/2}/2 - H_1/2 + D/2 - 2J_1 - 2J_2 - J_3 - J_4 - J_5 - J_6$
14	$\oplus$ + - $\oplus$	2	$E_{14} = -H_1/2 + D/2 - J_3 + J_4 - J_5 - J_6$
15	$\oplus$ - - $\oplus$	1	$E_{15} = H_{1/2}/2 - H_1/2 + D/2 + 2J_1 + 2J_2 - J_3 - J_4 - J_5 - J_6$
16	$\ominus$ + + $\ominus$	1	$E_{16} = -H_{1/2}/2 + H_1/2 + D/2 + 2J_1 - 2J_2 - J_3 - J_4 - J_5 + J_6$
17	$\ominus$ - + $\ominus$	2	$E_{17} = H_1/2 + D/2 - J_3 + J_4 - J_5 + J_6$
18	$\ominus$ - - $\ominus$	1	$E_{18} = H_{1/2}/2 + H_1/2 + D/2 - 2J_1 + 2J_2 - J_3 - J_4 - J_5 + J_6$